

## THE “SOLAS” OF THE REFORMATION

The Reformation’s theological basis, though deep, was simple, resting on a handful of fundamental principles. Our salvation is entirely by God’s grace and not of our own doing. We receive that grace, and are justified, through faith, and not by any works we do. These principles were set forth in Article IV of the Augsburg Confession.<sup>1</sup> To these material principles of the Reformation is added the formal principle, stated in the Formula of Concord, that the sole norm and rule of doctrine is the Holy Scripture. These three principles are referred to as the “three solas”—by grace alone, through faith alone, learned from Scripture alone. Some writers, especially among the Reformed, would add two other “solas”—for the sake of Christ alone, and to God alone the glory.<sup>2</sup> Lutherans would not disagree with them as to that, though those two “solas” are actually *solo propter Christum* and *solī Deo gloria*.

Nothing could be more important to each of us than knowing whether we are saved, whether we are destined for eternal life with God. There has been a certain tension in Christian doctrine from the very beginning. Christians agree that the saved have eternal life with God; “For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life”<sup>3</sup>; “In my Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and

prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.”<sup>4</sup> All Christians likewise agree that our salvation comes by God’s grace. “For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.”<sup>5</sup> This is the *sola gratia*, not on its face a controversial teaching.

How do we get this grace? The Scripture itself provides on its face a couple of answers, which, if they are taken alone and not together as a whole, could appear to conflict, and it is at this point that the Reformation parts ways with Rome. The Roman Catholic church has, for about 800 years, told us that there are certain works necessary on our part both before and after justification. Before justification there is a preparation necessary, they say. These include, in addition to the faith fear of Divine justice; hope in the mercy of God for the sake of the merits of Christ; the beginning of the love of God; hate and detestation of sin; and the purpose of receiving Baptism and of beginning a new life.<sup>6</sup> These merits are sometimes referred to as *meritum congrui*.

With justifying grace, the Romans teach, the soul is transformed, and the Christian becomes a partaker of the Divine nature, receiving an infusion of, and developing a habit of, or an aptitude for, charity.<sup>7</sup> The justified man, so transformed, becomes more like God, being in a state of grace, and does good works, sometimes called *meritum condigni*.<sup>8</sup> These works, in turn, give man a claim to a supernatural reward, and that reward is eternal life and “an increase of heavenly glory”.<sup>9</sup> As support for this teaching, the Romans cite St. Paul: “(God)

will render to every man according to his deeds.”<sup>10</sup> Ott quotes as an express statement of the *meritum condigni*: “the crown of justice which the Lord, the just judge, will render...”.<sup>11</sup>

This exegesis is questionable, once one looks at it in context. Paul is here not talking about good works that he has done, for which he is to receive a reward. Rather, he is talking about remaining in the faith, and the reward is to those who are in the faith. Here is the passage in context: “For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.”<sup>12</sup> The whole passage shows that it is not any particular good work, but simply remaining in the faith, that brings this crown of righteousness.

The Roman position is frequently supported by reference to several statements in the Epistle of St. James. James 1:12 is cited by Ott for the proposition that eternal life is the reward for good works<sup>13</sup> and James 2:17, 24 for the more sweeping pronouncement that justification is by works as well as by faith.<sup>14</sup>

More recent Roman dogmatic statements have backed away from the *meritum congrui*. The Catechism of the Catholic Church tells us: “Since the initiative belongs to God in the order of grace, *no one can merit the initial grace of*

forgiveness and justification, at the beginning of conversion.” (emphasis in original)<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, the *meritum condigni* is still very much part of Roman teaching: “Moved by the Holy Spirit and by charity, *we can then merit* for ourselves and for others the graces needed for our sanctification, for the increase of charity, and for the attainment of eternal life.” (emphasis in original)<sup>16</sup> Obviously, fairness requires that we not task Rome with a doctrine that it has abandoned; what it still teaches remains part of the discussion. To understand the Lutheran and Reformed arguments in this regard, it is necessary to include Rome’s teachings of *meritum congrui* as well as *meritum condigni*.

We are talking here about a change in Rome’s teachings that has occurred just in the last few decades—in church history, something that might as well be yesterday. The *meritum congrui* was still in Ott’s dogmatics in 1960. Since then there have been the Second Vatican Council, the accession to the Papacy of John Paul II and the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification of the Pope and the Lutheran World Federation*. It is certainly relevant to confessional Lutherans’ criticism of that declaration<sup>17</sup> that the edition of the catechism that came out since the declaration still states that we attain eternal life with our own merits.

The Romans concede freely that this leaves us without any assurance of salvation, but that we must doubt to the end of our days whether we have eternal life. Ott writes, “A just man merits for himself through each good work an increase of sanctifying grace, eternal life (if he dies in a state of grace) and an increase of heavenly glory...As grace is the preliminary stage of glory, and as

glory is proportional to good works, the measure of grace must also increase with good works.”<sup>18</sup> Since “the grace by which we are justified may be lost, and is lost by every grievous sin”, the infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost are lost every time we slip.

But the entire works-based theory of justification is itself a change from Rome’s own former teachings. Such had not always been the Catholic understanding of justification. While in Reformation theology, by the principle of *sola Scriptura*, the writings of early church fathers cannot be themselves the source of doctrine, they certainly are a witness to what the Church has taught at other times, how the Scripture has been understood, and where they in fact are consonant with Scripture they are good and valuable.<sup>19</sup>

When one takes the Roman teaching that the authority of Scripture also applies to the writings of those in apostolic succession as they are received into the tradition of the Church,<sup>20</sup> these writings have from a Roman perspective even more weight. So looking at some earlier Church sources is helpful whether one begins from a Protestant or a Roman dogmatic structure. (I refer throughout this article to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church simply as “Roman” so as not to imply that Lutheran or Reformed theology is not catholic, as defined by the three historic creeds.)

St. Augustine writes, “Men are not saved by good works, nor by the free determination of their own will, but by the grace of God through faith.”<sup>21</sup> Here

is the *sola fide*, from the pen of one of the greatest Catholic fathers. He continues, "But this part of the human race to which God has promised pardon and a share in His eternal kingdom, can they be restored through the merit of their own works?"<sup>22</sup> He adds later that sinful man needs a mediator, which is Jesus Christ<sup>23</sup>. Further, he writes that the pardon given for the sake of Christ's atonement extends to the entire life of the saints, which is not free of sin, pointing to St. John's admonition: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us."<sup>24</sup> While St. Augustine does refer to works after conversion as assisting in salvation<sup>25</sup>, this is in the context of works as the marks of a live faith.<sup>26</sup>

Further, while it is certainly true that satisfaction must be made for sin<sup>27</sup>, it was long recognized that in fact this satisfaction has been made for us vicariously by Christ. St. Anselm of Canterbury writes:

...the father was unwilling for the human race to be restored unless man performed a great act, equal to the Son's death. Since reason did not demand what another could not do, the Son says that the Father wills his death, while he himself prefers to suffer death rather than leave the human race unsaved. It is as though he were to say: "Since thou dost not will that the reconciliation of the world should be brought about in any other way, I say that in this sense, thou willest my death. Therefore, let this thy will be done; that is, let my death take place, that the world may be reconciled to

thee.”<sup>28</sup>

St. Anselm puts great emphasis on the redemptive act of Christ:

This is just what puzzles them most, when we call this deliverance “redemption”. In what captivity, they ask us, in what prison or in whose power were you held, from which God could not deliver you, without redeeming you by so many labors and in the end by his own blood? Perhaps we will reply: He redeemed us from sins and from his own wrath and from hell and from the power of the devil, whom he came himself to conquer for us, since we could not do it for ourselves.<sup>29</sup>

It is not surprising that perhaps the strongest echo of St. Anselm of Canterbury would be in the following prayer written by another archbishop of Canterbury almost 500 years later, Thomas Cranmer: “All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”<sup>30</sup>

Rome, while honoring and certainly never repudiating St. Anselm, has not given his theology anything like the credit it is due. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* ascribes this largely to the form of his writing and the turning of Roman theology

soon after he had written to the Aristotelian approach of St. Thomas Aquinas and others.<sup>31</sup> Perhaps that is how it was passed up; but the substance of his writing on this point is honored in the omission from the canons of the council of Trent, etc.. Far more plausible is that Rome did not want to show that the first of the great Scholastics believed in *sola fide*.

The Lutheran confessors tell us that St. Bernard of Clairvaux changed his view of justification right at the end of his life, quoting him as writing: "There is need that you must first believe that you cannot have forgiveness of sin except by the grace of God; next that thereafter you cannot have and do any good work, unless God grants it to you; lastly that you cannot earn eternal life with your works, though it is not given to you without merit"<sup>32</sup> and exclaiming, as he looked back on a life of all manner of work for the church, "*Perdite vixi!* I have lived a sinful life!"<sup>33</sup>

The Reformation at least initially made this the central article of its protest against Rome. Luther wrote:

The first and chief article is this.

*That Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, died for our sins, as was raised again for our justification, Rom. 4,25;*

*And He alone is the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world, John 1, 25; and God has laid upon Him the iniquities of us all, Is. 53,6.*



*Likewise: All have sinned and are justified without merit by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, in His blood, Rom. 3,23 f.*

Now, since it is necessary to believe this, and it cannot be otherwise acquired or apprehended by any work, law or merit, it is clear and certain that this faith alone justifies us, as St. Paul says, Rom. 3,28: *For we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law.* Likewise v. 26: *That He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Christ.*

Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth, and whatever will not abide, should sink to ruin...And upon this article all things depend which we teach and practise in opposition to the Pope, the devil and the whole world.<sup>34</sup> (Emphasis added by editors of edition used; form of Scripture cites in original.)

Luther and Melanchthon (principal author of the Augsburg Confessions) are in accord with St. Anselm's view in seeing the righteousness of the faithful not as some work that they do either before or after conversion, but as an essentially judicial act by God, in which Christ's satisfaction operates as a redemption, through which the righteousness of Christ is then imputed to us and we are declared righteous. Luther emphasized the point in his translation of the

Bible by translating Rom. 3:28 "*allein durch den Glauben*"—by faith alone, "alone" being an insertion but one that does not undermine, but reinforces, the text.

Rome rejects this understanding<sup>35</sup> notwithstanding the above-cited authority of some of their own greatest theologians and saints. The Council of Trent went so far as to say, "If anyone says that the ungodly is justified by faith alone in such a way that he understands that nothing else is required which cooperates toward obtaining the grace of justification and that it is in no way necessary for him to be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will, let him be anathema.<sup>36</sup>...If anyone says that a man is justified either solely by the imputation of Christ's righteousness or solely by the remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and charity which is poured out into their hearts by the Holy Spirit and stays with them, or also that the grace by which we are justified is only the favor of God, let him be anathema."<sup>37</sup> So says Rome, but what does Scripture say about the respective role of faith and works in our justification?

Again, as will be examined more closely below, Scripture is the sole norm and rule of doctrine. All other authorities are normed by Scripture.<sup>38</sup> Still, the Romans have adduced some Scripture in apparent support of their position. How are we to understand what we are reading? We apply some basic rules of understanding Scripture.

The most basic rule is that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture., which is how Christ and the Apostles explained Scripture.<sup>39</sup> Passages have to be

seen and understood in their context.<sup>40</sup> Ott's reference to a portion of 2 Tim. 4:8 without giving the whole verse or preceding verses is an example of the dangers of misinterpretation that inhere if something is lifted out of its proper context; they have to be interpreted with each other. They have a single Author,<sup>41</sup> and a single meaning, which is not to be any other meaning than that which the Holy Spirit intended.<sup>42</sup> It "alone can shed light on those verses which appear to interpreters dark or difficult."<sup>43</sup>

So we cannot read Scripture schizophrenically; there can ultimately be no conflict in the apparent conflict between the Scriptural authorities cited above. Rome would make the works that do not justify us refer only to works of ceremonial Jewish law<sup>44</sup> or to those done before conversion.<sup>45</sup> But that does not work, and the key is in the seemingly innocuous verse that tells us that "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness."<sup>46</sup>

That key will open only one reading of Rom. 3:, Eph. 2:8,9 and James 2. We see that it is not that Abram had gone from Ur to Haran to Canaan, nor that he proceeded to make a baby—after all, efforts to anticipate God's promise, though Abraham did beget a son, Ishmael, that was not the promised son.<sup>47</sup> It is that he trusted God.<sup>48</sup> Again, Abraham's trust in God directs us back to another passage—his preparing to sacrifice Isaac. God did not actually want Abraham to sacrifice Isaac; He ultimately provided the sheep to be sacrificed. But Abraham believed God's promises, that through this child, God would make Abraham the father of many nations. God would not and did not betray his promise.<sup>49</sup>

Therefore, when Sts. Paul and James each speak of Abraham and his being counted righteous, both actually citing the same verse, they cannot mean different things. They must mean the same thing. And that same thing is simply this: Faith, if it is genuine, will show itself in works. Those works are the marks of a live faith; a faith that will not produce works is not really faith at all.<sup>50</sup> Faith is not simply knowing and believing the story. The devil himself knows and believes the story. Faith is an abiding confidence in God. With such faith, “the Holy Ghost is received, hearts are renewed with new affections, so as to be able to do good works.”<sup>51</sup>

Those works are not done because they justify. Justification is by that point accomplished. But the regenerate man seeks to do the will of God; “he that knows that he has a Father gracious to him through Christ, truly knows God; he knows also that God cares for him” and is reconciled to God. The good works follow, they do not cause, justification, which is and remains by faith *alone—sola fide*.<sup>52</sup>

There is no question that the principle of *Sola Scriptura*, “Only Scripture”, as the source of our doctrine, lies at the very heart of the Reformation, and arguably of Christianity itself. Christ Himself, when questioned as to his authenticity, responded, “Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.”<sup>53</sup> St. John asserts the Scriptures as containing the saving faith: “But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and

that believing ye might have life through his name.”<sup>54</sup>

When, in the early apostolic era, the Bereans wished to be sure that what they heard from Paul and other speakers was true, St. Luke tells us with approval that they “searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.”<sup>55</sup> St. Paul, warning St. Timothy of the coming obstacles to his teaching, urges him to continue in what he has learned, and proceeds to define that as the Scriptures, inspired of God and “profitable for doctrine”<sup>56</sup> In his epistle to the Galatians, he warns against adding or changing anything.<sup>57</sup>

The principle of *Sola Scriptura* is upheld by the very church fathers to whom opponents of the principle wish to refer for doctrine, including Irenaeus,<sup>58</sup> St. John Chrysostom<sup>59</sup>, and St. Augustine.<sup>60</sup> Like *sola gratia* and *sola fide*, it was not a new conception at the time of the Reformation.

Luther, in his response to the charges at Worms, relied on Scripture and demanded scriptural refutation, noting that popes and councils had erred and contradicted each other.<sup>61</sup> His chief work on this doctrine is “On the Church and the Councils”. He quotes St. Augustine’s injunction to believe none of the fathers without Scripture on his side. He writes further:

St. Bernard declares that he learned his wisdom from the trees, such as oaks and pines, which were his teachers; that is,

he conceived his ideas from Scripture and pondered them under the trees. He adds that he regards the holy fathers highly, but does not heed all their sayings, explaining why in the following parable: he would rather drink from the spring itself than from the brook, as do all men, who once they have a chance to drink from the spring forget about the brook, unless they use the brook to lead them to the spring. Thus Scripture, too, must remain master and judge, for when we follow the brooks too far, they lead us too far away from the spring, and lose both their taste and nourishment, until they lose themselves in the salty sea, as happened under the papacy.<sup>62</sup>

In “On the Councils and the Church”, the entire Reformation argument for *sola Scriptura* is set forth. Councils disagreed with each other. Eminent and revered early Church fathers disagreed, for example on whether one who had been baptized by heretics without the formulation of Matt. 28 had to be baptized.<sup>63</sup> Perhaps the greatest contradiction of councils is that between the Second Council of Orange and the Council of Trent. The former affirmed Augustine’s teaching of *sola fide* against both Pelagius’s assertion that we could of our own free will achieve salvation by our own deeds and Vincent of Lerins’s Semi-Pelagianism, which claimed that we had to cooperate in our salvation, though acknowledging that God’s grace was indeed necessary.<sup>64</sup>

Luther rejects the idea that a council can establish an article of faith, saying only the Holy Spirit Himself could do that.<sup>65</sup>

The question sometimes raised is whether Lutherans, with our Book of Concord, have simply established a new tradition to form an independent source of doctrine. Some Roman Catholics accuse Lutheranism of that.<sup>66</sup> There is, however, a radical difference between Roman or Eastern tradition and the Lutheran Confessions. There is a host of Roman teachings for which either no authority or dubious authority can be found in Scripture. Mary's Immaculate Conception; her Assumption, and her perpetual virginity are doctrines of the Roman Church. There is no Scripture to support them, but only tradition of indeterminate origin. In the case of the Assumption, it was not even doctrine of the Roman Church until the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Their own encyclopedia attempts to prove that this is ancient doctrine, incredibly, by pointing to the late fourth century writer Epiphanius, who wrote that he knew nothing about it!<sup>67</sup>

In the same way, the Pope as the successor of Peter, and through Peter, the head of the whole Church of Christ, is based entirely on a thoroughly discreditable reading of Matthew 16 as making Peter the foundation of the Church, an interpretation that, in fact, the early Church fathers also rejected, saying that the rock on which the Church is founded is

Christ Himself, and Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ. The Church is not built on the *petros* of Peter's person, but on the *petra* of his confession.

The idea of the Pope as successor to Peter has its origin in Eusebius's statement that Peter was the first bishop of Rome.<sup>68</sup> Eusebius, however, was attributing no particular authority to that office by reason of such an illustrious first holder. Even if Eusebius is right, which is questionable for any number of reasons, that proves nothing. Instead, it turns out that the idea of the successor of Peter as "supreme pope and vicar of Christ" has its origin in the Donation of Constantine, a forged 8<sup>th</sup> century instrument.<sup>69</sup>

There is only one comparable item in the Lutheran Confessions, which are otherwise entirely an exposition of Scripture. Selnecker's insertion of the word "*sempervirgine*" into his Latin translation of Part I of the Smalcald Articles is the introduction of something utterly out of character with the Book of Concord. The belief in Mary's perpetual virginity is not necessarily wrong or impermissible, but it is something for which there is no Scriptural warrant. In addition to being a deviation from the rule of *sola scriptura*, it is also bad translation practice. This was a translation of Luther's text done 30 years after Luther's death, inserting a word Luther had not used. By comparison, Jonas, when his German translation of the Apology included material not in Melanchthon's original, he consulted with Melanchthon, who agreed with those additions.<sup>70</sup>



The Confessions are not an addition to Scripture, in the sense of the Roman tradition. There is no claim of some unwritten apostolic tradition preserved within the Church or of a teaching authority of the Church which may propound doctrines.<sup>71</sup> Instead, the confessions set forth as a given that there is only one rule and norm of doctrine, and that is Scripture. The authority of Scripture is, in Robert Preus's words, absolute and final.<sup>72</sup> That is why they cite Scripture hundreds, if not thousands, of times.<sup>73</sup>

What the Confessions do accomplish is a systematization of Scriptural doctrine. All of the central doctrines of Scripture are presented in them unaltered. The Confessions are confessed "not because it was composed by our theologians, but because it has been taken from God's Word and is founded firmly and well therein...."<sup>74</sup> That is a direct disclaimer of having any kind of magisterial authority, of having the Holy Spirit in the treasure of the heart of Luther, Chemnitz or any other Lutheran Confessor.

The Church has assembled confessional statements from the very beginning. The Creeds are themselves brief confessional statements. They were formulated against the heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries at or as a result of the first four great councils of the church. Again, those creeds are not confessed because four great councils produced them, or because our theologians produced them, but because they correctly state the teaching of Scripture.<sup>75</sup> Creeds and confessions that simply summarize Scripture are not

setting themselves up as independent authorities. The Church, in its ministerial role, setting forth for its people that which Scripture says. The principle of *sola Scriptura* is upheld with confessions that are themselves Scriptural.

The “solos” are valuable to the Church. Kept in mind, they keep those who would uphold the Reformation from drifting into the errors that prompted the Reformation in the first place. Abandoned, they lead to Romanizing, or even worse, into Pentecostal enthusiasm in which doctrine moves this way and that with the personal feelings of each Christian, or into existentialist maunderings that would deprive the Word itself of its authority in our eyes. Through the “solos”, we can remain on the right road, faithful to the Word and faithful to the Reformation of the Church.

---

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> AC IV: It is further taught that we cannot attain forgiveness of sins and righteousness before God through our merit, works and satisfaction, but that we receive forgiveness and become righteous before God by grace, for the sake of Christ, through faith, as we believe that Christ has suffered for us, and that for His sake sins are forgiven and righteousness and eternal life are given to us freely. For God wishes to hold and credit this faith as righteousness before Him, as St. Paul says to the Romans in chapters 3 and 4. (My translation from the German.)

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g. Gregg Strawbridge, “The Five Solas of the Reformation”, available <http://www.fivesolas.com/5solas.htm>, accessed October 30, 2006.

<sup>3</sup> John 3:16 (this and all Scripture cites herein are King James Version unless otherwise noted)

<sup>4</sup> John 14:2-3

<sup>5</sup> Rom. 3:23-24

<sup>6</sup> Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, Fourth Edition, James Bastible, tr. (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1960), 252-253.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 256, citing St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I II 110, 3-4.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 256-257.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 264, 267.

<sup>10</sup> Rom. 2:6; Ott, 265.

- 
- <sup>11</sup> 2 Tim. 4:8 (part) (version unknown), quoted by Ott, 165.
- <sup>12</sup> 2 Tim. 4:6-8.
- <sup>13</sup> Ott, 268.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 254.
- <sup>15</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Second Edition (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), 487.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>17</sup> Kurt Marquart, “Which Way Confessional Lutheranism in North America?” lecture, Melrose Park, IL, October 21, 2004, refers to the agreement as the “Augsburg Concession” See also Commission on Theology and Church Relations, *The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification in Confessional Lutheran Perspective* (St. Louis: Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, 1999).
- <sup>18</sup> Ott, 267.
- <sup>19</sup> FC SD, Norm and Rule of Doctrine See Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, Vol. I (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970), 38.
- <sup>20</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 24-27.
- <sup>21</sup> St. Augustine, *The Enchiridion of Faith, Hope and Love*, J.F. Shaw, tr., Henry Paolucci, ed. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1965), 36.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 75-76, quoting 1 John 1:8.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 84-85
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 78-79, quoting Gal. 5:6.
- <sup>27</sup> Ott, 434 et seq.
- <sup>28</sup> St. Anselm of Canterbury, “Why God Became Man” (“Cur Deus Homo”), Eugene R. Fairweather, ed. and tr., *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), 115.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.
- <sup>30</sup> “Order of Holy Communion”, *Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Seabury Press, 1928), 80.
- <sup>31</sup> “St. Anselm”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*; available <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01546a.htm>; Internet; accessed October 25, 2004.
- <sup>32</sup> St. Bernard of Clairvaux, quoted in Ap. III.212 (in German, but not in Latin, text).
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>34</sup> SA II.I.
- <sup>35</sup> Ott, p. 250.
- <sup>36</sup> Council of Trent, Ch. X, Canon IX.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, Canon XI.
- <sup>38</sup> See note 17, *supra*.
- <sup>39</sup> Raymond F. Surburg, *The Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (Ft. Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, no date), 53, 56; for comparison of the Reformed statement of this principle, James Montgomery Boice, *Foundations of the Christian Faith* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1986), 93.
- <sup>40</sup> Boice, 93.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.
- <sup>42</sup> Surburg, p. 56
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>44</sup> Ott, 254.
- <sup>45</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 487.
- <sup>46</sup> Gal. 3:6.
- <sup>47</sup> Gen. 17:20, 21.
- <sup>48</sup> Gen. 15:6.
- <sup>49</sup> Gen. 22:12-13.
- <sup>50</sup> James 2:17-26.
- <sup>51</sup> AC Arts. VI and XX.
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>53</sup> John 5:39.

- 
- <sup>54</sup> John 20:31.
- <sup>55</sup> Acts 17:10-11.
- <sup>56</sup> 2 Tim. 3:16.
- <sup>57</sup> Gal. 1:8-9.
- <sup>58</sup> Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 3:1, available at <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103301.htm>, accessed May 25, 2005.
- <sup>59</sup> St. John Chrysostom, Homily 9, commentary on 2 Tim. 3:16-17; Homily 13, commentary on 2 Cor. 7:1, available at <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/230709.htm>. Accessed May 25, 2005.
- <sup>60</sup> St. Augustine, *Against the Donatists*, 2:1-4, available at <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/14082.htm>. Accessed May 25, 2005.
- <sup>61</sup> Martin Luther, “Here I Stand”, *Faith and Freedom: An Invitation to the Writings of Martin Luther* (New York: Vintage Books, 2002), 20.
- <sup>62</sup> Martin Luther, “On the Councils and the Church”, *Luther's Works*, Vol. 41 : Church and Ministry III. Edited by Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Hilton C. Oswald and Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1999, c1966), 20.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>64</sup> Canons of the Council of Orange, available at <http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/history/council.orange.txt>, accessed May 25, 2005.
- <sup>65</sup> SA II.II.15.
- <sup>66</sup> J. Dominguez, “Sola Scriptura—The Bible Alone?”, available at <http://biblia.com/theology/church.htm>, accessed May 18, 2005.
- <sup>67</sup> “The Feast of the Assumption”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, available at <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02006b.htm>. Accessed May 18, 2005.
- <sup>68</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Church History*, Book II, available at <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/250102.htm>. Accessed May 25, 2005.
- <sup>69</sup> “Donation of Constantine”, available at <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/donatconst.html>. Accessed May 25, 2005.
- <sup>70</sup> F. Bente, Historical Introduction, *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), 43.
- <sup>71</sup> Cf. Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc.), 4-5.
- <sup>72</sup> Robert D. Preus, *Getting Into the Theology of Concord* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977), 21.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>74</sup> FC SD Comprehensive Summary, Rule and Norm, 5.
- <sup>75</sup> Ibid.; Luther, “On the Councils and the Church”.